

COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC/PUBLIC SAFETY

August 10, 2004

Chairman Sysyn called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Sysyn, Guinta, Smith, Forest, O'Neil

Messrs.: B. Wheeler, Lt. Valenti, S. Silberberg, L. LaFreniere, T. Lolicata,
J. Shaffer, E. Sawyer

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 1 of the agenda:

Communication from Alderman Forest requesting no through trucking and prohibiting commercial motor vehicular and truck traffic on Goffstown Road from Straw Road to the Goffstown line.

Alderman Forest stated I believe there are people here from Manchester and the Goffstown Road area who may want to speak and I don't know if Madame Chairman you want to let them speak. Let me explain what this is all about. Back in May I received a phone call from an actual Goffstown resident informing me that there was a development being proposed in the Goffstown Road/Manchester line area of a nine building industrial park. The person who called me stated that there was a public hearing the following night. I went to the Mayor about it and the Planning Department and wanted to know if they knew about it but apparently nobody in the Planning Department, the Mayor's Office or Building Department knew anything about it so I requested that somebody go. Leon LaFreniere from the Building Department went on that following Thursday, which was the following night just as an observer. Apparently Leon did make some comments about the project. Leon was informed by and I am not sure if it was a Selectman or somebody on their Planning Board that Manchester wouldn't listen to them on the project we had across the bridge so, therefore, they didn't want to listen to Manchester on this project. I did ask the Mayor's Office and City Solicitor to appeal their final decision and apparently in their wisdom they decided that the case was not winnable. Since then I have received maybe 30 or 40 phone calls from both Goffstown residents and Manchester residents about the fact that they were never notified about the project and abutters were not given notices. Ex-Mayor Emile Beaulieu called me and stated that he lives right across the street and he didn't know about the project until it was too late. I do have an article here that

was printed in the Goffstown newspaper stating that it was a nine building industrial park that is going to be built and they were planning on doing some repairs on the Manchester side. They are talking about the fact that there will be anywhere from a 1,000 to 1,200 vehicle increase per shift on Goffstown Road. I understand that Goffstown did not do any impact studies on this project. I checked with Southern NH Services and the Highway Department. There is an average of 11,000 vehicles that now use Goffstown Road. I am not sure how many are trucks. I think that this would impact Goffstown Road quite a bit and what I am asking is that Goffstown Road from the area of Straw Road to the Goffstown line actually be shut off to tractor trailers and through trucking just like we did on Goffstown Road several years ago. Like I said there are constituents here and it is very difficult for them to get in and out of their streets as it is now and I think anywhere from 30,000 to 35,000 vehicles per week will make it a lot more difficult for them.

Alderman O'Neil asked, Alderman Forest, do you know currently the commercial operations on Dunbarton Road if they have utilized the backside, Straw Road and whether they are allowed to truck on Goffstown Road currently.

Alderman Forest answered right now the only restrictions that are there are from 9:30 PM until 7 AM and that is being violated on a daily basis also. I am not sure because I have researched it and can't find it but I know that 30 or 35 years ago when Lane Construction actually started operating there there was a condition with the neighbors similar to Huse Road that they were not to use Straw Road but over the last 15 or 20 years they have opened up the Straw Road area and they are using it and everything else.

Alderman O'Neil asked so legally they can currently use Goffstown Back Road during the day.

Alderman Forest answered yes from 7 AM until 9:30 PM. They can use Straw Road, Dunbarton Road and Goffstown Road and they do.

Chairman Sysyn asked so the trucks can use the roads during the day.

Alderman Forest answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil asked and those are for the businesses currently in Manchester and I guess anybody coming from Goffstown can also use those.

Alderman Forest answered yes. Again the reason I am asking to do this is because the primary thing at least from what I understand from this project is the fact that two of those buildings are going to be industrial distribution 24 hours a day, 7 days

a week, which will greatly impact the residential neighborhood on Goffstown Road in Manchester.

Chairman Sysyn stated but that is just at night that you are talking about right.

Alderman Forest answered I am talking about shutting it off all together to commercial vehicles. There are no businesses along Goffstown Road that need tractor-trailers or anything.

Chairman Sysyn asked so they would have to go around.

Alderman Forest stated they would have to turn left and go into Goffstown and use 114 and not come into Manchester through a residential neighborhood.

Alderman O'Neil asked what happens to...there is at least one store on Goffstown Road and I can't think of the name of it.

Alderman Forest answered that is Grace Limousine.

Alderman O'Neil asked what happens to them.

Alderman Forest answered it wouldn't affect them at all because it wouldn't be...trucks delivering to them do not come in from Goffstown they come in from Manchester.

Alderman O'Neil asked what happens if they are going the other way though.

Alderman Forest answered then they would have to use Straw Road or come around and use Dunbarton Road up Terrill Hill.

Chairman Sysyn stated we did get some responses from Goffstown that are attached to the agenda.

Alderman Smith asked are any of the elected officials from Goffstown here.

Chairman Sysyn called Mr. Robert Wheeler forward.

Mr. Robert Wheeler, Chairman, Board of Selectmen in Goffstown stated I heard Alderman Forest explain his position and I have to share with you that ours is dramatically different. In Goffstown we have two main thoroughfares that are corridors in and out of the community. Mast Road is one and the Goffstown Back Road is the other. It doesn't only serve the community of Goffstown. It serves Manchester, Weare, New Boston, and Dunbarton. Those two corridors are the

corridors that bring people to and from work, the industrial and commercial hub that you have here in the City. In Goffstown we think that we have had tremendous growth in the recent past. The reality is that we haven't had much at all but Weare and New Boston have and we bear the brunt of that traffic as they come to the city to their work. The difficulty in this particular request as I see it is it doesn't seem to appear to be a public safety issue here. There seems to be a focus to prevent development in an industrial park that is just across the Manchester/Goffstown border. The practical reality of this request is we have an area that perhaps is a couple of thousand feet long and you don't want any through trucking. That is my understanding of this request. I have no idea how you are going to police it. I don't know what it is going to accomplish and I can't imagine what an officer is going to say in court to a judge to defend that type of an arrest. I arrested them because they went through 2,000 feet of no through traffic. I think that there needs to be a greater explanation from the proponents of this to indicate that it makes any sense at all. I have heard from the city through Bill Jabjiniak who is concerned with economic development. There is an area of mutual development that we have been talking about at a different level and this thwarts that kind of effort. I suppose if I lived there and I was one of the houses anything that would reduce traffic in that area I would appreciate but there needs to be a recognition of the economic impact that closing this 2,000 feet of road will do. I can tell you as a matter of practicality that there are times when our plow trucks get there in the winter before yours and the plow drops and we plow your road. It is just a short span of road into Manchester from the Goffstown line. It is something that we have cooperated with very much in the past and we certainly hope that we can continue with that cooperation. I would be happy to respond to any questions.

Alderman O'Neil stated you mentioned the concern...it is kind of a like a two party issue here where Goffstown has an opportunity to do something positive for the citizens in that town and create some industrial tax base versus Manchester's concern about quality of life for our residents. It just seems to me that there must be a way for both communities to work out something that is in the best interest of both communities. I don't know that there has actually been dialogue to do that.

Mr. Wheeler responded I am not aware of any except at the economic development level. I have to share with you that somebody has a lot more knowledge about this development than I do that they already know what is going in. I can share with you that in Goffstown we haven't gotten that far to know who the tenants are and what exactly is going to be built. This is very much in the information and design change. That land has been zoned industrial probably for the last 15-20 years...

Alderman Forest interjected since 1999.

Mr. Wheeler replied it was much longer than that, Sir. That property was zoned many years ago industrial and at the time notification was sent to the City that that was going to happen and we asked for comments. This is not anything new. What is new is that it has turned from a zoning issue to a practical application. There is an owner that has stepped forward and is going through the process in the Town of Goffstown. To my knowledge he doesn't yet have an approved project but he is going through the application process. We do not know who the tenants are going to be or what the volume of trucking is going to be. I don't know where people are getting that kind of information. The total area of that is not such that I think it would be a tremendous impact to traffic on that road. You compare the traffic that is already there that supports the Manchester taxes that is commercial and industrial because the workers come from the bedroom communities. I think we need to understand that there is mutual interest here.

Alderman Forest stated from some research that was done by staff and myself I believe it was Mr. Silberberg in 1999 or the property was purchased by Mr. Silberberg, whoever the owner was applied to have it rezoned in 1999. Your Goffstown Board approved that in 1999. According to your Goffstown records it was approved and then there was some litigation about the ownership of the property, which was settled this past year. Then Mr. Silberberg filed to your Board for the industrial park, which was granted in May. Leon LaFreniere was there in May. I know myself that Frank Thomas, Pam Goucher and Leon LaFreniere have been trying to get information from Goffstown about the project and it has been very difficult. The reason I am here is because Goffstown...you know we have gotten some cooperation from employees but we haven't gotten any cooperation from staff or anybody in Goffstown. That is why I am here. This was the only alternative for me. We wanted to talk to Goffstown earlier but the administration in Goffstown didn't. When I started getting all of these phone calls...this was the only alternative I had to appease my constituents in stopping this heavy traffic on Goffstown Road. It is a residential neighborhood and there is no question in my mind...granted you are doing an industrial park and it is probably going to be a boom to Goffstown because it is right on the Manchester line but I can't see all of these tractor trailers or whatever it is going up and down Goffstown Road and that is why I am doing this.

Chairman Sysyn asked Mr. Wheeler are you saying the Planning Board has no idea who is going in there – what type of businesses.

Mr. Wheeler answered I don't serve on the Planning Board. I know that the application is in process. I don't believe that it has been approved. The owner says it hasn't been approved. There may be people who have a pretty good picture about what the result is going to be but I don't believe...

Alderman Forest interjected the minutes from your last meeting say it was approved. I can't get the copy and send it to you. The minutes of your last Planning Board meeting state that they approved it that night. That was in May.

Alderman Smith asked does anybody know how many residents are going to be impacted by this 2,000 feet. How many homes?

Alderman Forest answered I can't give you an exact number but it is everybody from the Goffstown line to 93 along Goffstown Road.

Alderman Smith asked can I ask the Police Department to come forward and let us know how they are going to enforce this if we do approve it.

Lt. Valenti stated I guess like any other law we would enforce it. We would be out there ticketing and we would enforce the law. If there was an ordinance passed the Police would be out there ticketing the trucks that came through.

Alderman Smith stated if you are going to be out there you are going to be on the outskirts of Manchester and I can't see that the surveillance is going to be like it is in the inner City like where I live on Route 101 and 114 you have the occasional police vehicle check every hour but that is about all you are going to be able to do in my estimation.

Lt. Valenti responded that is correct. If the officer came upon a truck driving on that road then he could enforce the ordinance. We don't have the time and the manpower to sit on Goffstown Road or Straw Road waiting for a truck to come through.

Alderman Forest asked how to you enforce Gold Street right now, which is shut off to all through trucking. The same way? Do you have an officer there and if you see a truck there you issue a citation correct?

Lt. Valenti answered correct.

Chairman Sysyn asked do they have an officer there all the time.

Lt. Valenti answered no. You have a route officer and if he sees a violation it is up to him to take corrective action and issue a citation.

Alderman Guinta asked do you know how many residences would be impacted on the Manchester side

Lt. Valenti answered no.

Chairman Sysyn asked is there anybody in the audience who knows how many residences are going to be impacted.

Mr. Jeremy Duprey stated I am the Chairman of the Manchester/Goffstown citizens group. Our group currently has a membership of a little over 50 members and we have estimated that over 1,000 people will be impacted.

Chairman Sysyn asked 1,000 homes.

Mr. Duprey responded near 1,000 if you include all of the side roads and that counts parts of Goffstown also. Not 1,000 homes but 1,000 families.

Mr. Steven Silberberg stated thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak before you today. I am here on behalf of Silverbo Communications, which is the company that is in the process of developing the land. I am here principally to answer any of your questions about the project and perhaps to dispel any illusions about the project and the impact that it has on both the Manchester and Goffstown community. I appreciate how much we all rely on the local media as a source of information. Unfortunately the local media is not always in tune to the realities of life. As I sit here today I would like to address some of the specifics that have been raised today in terms of inconsistencies and some contradictions. The project was approved by the Goffstown Zoning Board. The project was approved by the Goffstown Planning Board. In accordance with the Goffstown ordinances it is not an approved project today. There are several other requirements that we have to meet in order to be granted final approval. We have no tenants for the project at this juncture. We don't have a distribution company that I know of that has signed a lease. We have no letters of intent. I don't know of anyone who is planning on using the building 24 hours a day. I have had some personal discussions with the Manchester Highway Department. That road currently has a restriction from 7 AM until 9:30 PM, which prohibits commercial traffic between Goffstown and 293. Based on that prohibition we have had several conversations with existing distribution companies and they have no interest in the site. They cannot operate their operation from that location with the existing restriction. If you have someone who is interested in a 24-hour distribution facility, I would love to meet them because we are having a tough time marketing the project and I could use all of the help I can get. We do have a miniature golf place that is looking at a parcel in back comprised of seven acres and we do have a church that is looking at the site. The abutters in Goffstown have sued the Town of Goffstown to stop the development so this entire conversation may be moot. They believe there is a safety hazard on the site. We have commissioned two traffic studies showing that there is no safety concerns that has been reviewed by Goffstown and the Southern

NH Planning Commission and I really don't want to bore this Committee with the details of the development. Suffice to say there has been a lot of focus on the project. With respect to the Town of Goffstown and the City of Manchester, we have retained Meridian Land Services to do our engineering work. When the project began four years ago we contacted the Manchester City Planning Department and told them what we were doing and invited them to participate with us or have a meeting. We again contacted them two years ago. I know that Manchester is a large City and Goffstown is a small city but we are actually in ongoing conversations with the Planning Board with respect to road improvements that we are going to make to the Manchester streets. We are going to widen it. We are going to have a right turn lane and a slow down lane and they have asked us to do certain things with respect to those streets. I appreciate the fact that this Board is unaware of the project but there are people at the Planning Board who are aware of it and we have served them with certified letters on at least two occasions telling them what we were doing and inviting them to participate in the project. I would be more than happy to answer any questions you may have about the project.

Alderman Smith asked in regards to our Planning Board when did you notify them. What date and what month and what year?

Mr. Silberberg answered we notified them last year by certified mail as a matter of courtesy and we notified them two and a half years ago when the project first got underway. They were notified by Jim Edwards of Meridian Land Services. At the conclusion of this meeting I will get you copies of both letters that went to the Manchester Planning Board.

Chairman Sysyn asked did they go to the Planning Board or the Planning Department.

Mr. Silberberg answered they did not appear at either of the first meetings. There was a representative as Alderman Forest suggested who appeared at the very last meeting who stated that Manchester was not in favor of the project.

Chairman Sysyn asked was that person from the Planning Board or the Planning Department.

Mr. Silberberg answered I don't know.

Alderman Forest stated Leon LaFreniere is here and I am going to ask him to step up.

Chairman Sysyn stated I don't remember that. I am on the Planning Board.

Alderman Smith stated it seems like we are put in a position of no knowledge whatsoever outside of what I received today. This is the only knowledge I have of the project. I really think that it behooves everybody to go back to the drawing board and come back at a later time because I don't have any facts or figures except what everybody is saying here. We don't know the concept of the proposal for the park. We don't know the number of residents impacted and if it is 1,000 or 10,000. I don't know what the project is...any time you talk about development it changes on a daily basis and I think that is why the residents are concerned. If it is not going to be a 24-hour service center I would go along with certain things but we want to protect our residents too. I don't have any information from our Planning Board. I don't have any information whatsoever. I have just been caught by this.

Mr. Silberberg responded I would be happy to provide each of you individually with the letters that we provided to the City of Manchester. We are open. We want to cooperate with you. We want to work with you. We need to work with you in order to make this project a success. There are only two roads to get to Goffstown from an interstate, 114, which doesn't work very well and with the 101 expansion it will be impossible and the Goffstown Back Road off of the Amoskeag Bridge. That is the only way commercial trucks can get to Goffstown. If the City of Manchester wants to terminate 2,000 feet so that there are no projects I don't have a problem with that but I think we should sit down and figure out if that is what Manchester really wants. The abutters have other issues and the neighbors have other issues. They have all been given notices. Regarding the neighbors to my right, they are unhappy with the decision of the Town of Goffstown and they have chosen to sue the Town of Goffstown and this land has been zoned industrial for many, many years. I did not have it rezoned. I would like to repeat that. I did not have the parcel rezoned.

Alderman Forest stated I didn't say you did.

Mr. Silberberg stated when we acquired it it was already zoned industrial.

Alderman Forest responded it was done prior to your purchasing the property. I agree with that.

Mr. Silberberg stated for those of you who don't know, this is the parcel of land with the seven radio towers on it, which you can see from the entire City of Manchester with the flashing lights. It is a 54-acre parcel. Under Manchester guidelines you could put 450,000 feet of industrial space there. We have proposed what is called a low-density park. We have a pond. We have walking trails and the goal is to use an absolute minimum density and keep the towers in place.

Those towers are for WKBR just to create some context. WKBR went off the air in the recession in the early 90's. The Town of Goffstown with the help of Mr. Wheeler actually...the town actually bought the parcel and put the station back on the air. That is where the title problems came from. They did what they could to try and insure that Manchester had at least one locally owned radio station. I think the citizens of Manchester actually owe Mr. Wheeler and his group a debt of favor because the Town of Goffstown, after they took the land for non-payment of taxes, could have scrapped the steel and Manchester would have one less media outlet here. It is sort of an amusing twist that we are here today.

Alderman Forest stated I would like Leon to come up and say something. I would like him to explain the meeting that he went to. I realize that Frank Thomas and Pam Goucher are not here but there were some minutes that you had copies of, I believe, of their meetings. Could you give us your comments on the meeting you attended?

Mr. Leon LaFreniere stated I actually attended the meeting at the behest of Alderman Forest. I would not normally...I think it wouldn't have been my role to have stepped in to that and the only reason I make that statement is because I probably feel almost as ill equipped to provide a real context for this project to this Committee as I did before the Planning Board in Goffstown that evening. However, I didn't testify that Manchester was against the project. I just raised the concern, which I believe existed then and still exists today about what the traffic impacts might be and requested that there be some efforts made to coordinate with the City of Manchester on how those traffic impacts might be mitigated. Specifically, I did raise an issue that had previous to this time to the best of my knowledge not been raised in that some of the traffic improvements that were part of the submission to the Goffstown Planning Board actually extended into the City of Manchester and into the City of Manchester street system. At that point when I brought this information back to the Highway Department and Planning Department I was told by both departments that they had no knowledge of any impacts on the City of Manchester street system nor any improvements proposed to the City of Manchester street system. There was that particular aspect that I felt was important to make sure that it was coordinated. Beyond that, as I said I tried to communicate that the City of Manchester did have concerns relative to the traffic impacts. I received some comments from the person that I understood represented the Board of Selectmen as the Planning Board member or as a Board of Selectmen representative to the Planning Board and that individual indicated to me that there was not a great deal of interest in having comments come from the City of Manchester at that point in the procedure, especially given the fact that the Board or at least this individual felt that the City of Manchester had not been responsive to the Town of Goffstown with regard to concerns that they may have had on the Goffstown border off of Biron Street. That wasn't something I was

prepared to comment on having not really been involved with the approvals process but the concern that was expressed to me was that it was felt that the City of Manchester did not take into account that the residents of this project would be using the parks in the Town of Goffstown and that wasn't the impression I was going to comment on. That wouldn't be appropriate. I don't know if there is anything else I can add.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think I agree with Alderman Smith. There is a lot of "he said, she said" here this evening. I would like to move that we put this item on the table. I think we need to open or reopen dialogue between the Town of Goffstown, the City of Manchester and the developer with obviously the City of Manchester representing the residents in that area. I also think at the same time that the current restriction that are on Goffstown Back Road from 9AM until 9:30 PM I can't see why we allow trucking that late in the evening to be honest with you. I remember the days that Lane Construction was running as asphalt plant there. I don't believe they are anymore. The old days of F&S Transit. That may be something for the residents that we need to look at. It may not be appropriate on the City side to have trucking until 9:30 PM anymore. I can only think that some of the reasons it was there was because Lane was doing nighttime paving operations maybe. I don't know but I am disappointed to hear that information may have come to the City and there was no response to the Town of Goffstown. I worked with Chairman Wheeler when we were both in the Legislature and I know that he will make sure that Goffstown steps up to the plate as I hope Manchester steps up to the plate and does what is best for both communities. I do want to make sure that the residents of that area are protected from the City side but the only way you do that is by having the two parties or three parties in this case- the Town of Goffstown, the City of Manchester and the developer sit down. With that I move to put it on the table.

Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion to table. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Sysyn stated I think Alderman Forest would also like to be involved in those meetings.

Alderman O'Neil responded absolutely. The City has to step back up to the plate on this thing if they were ever at the plate but I think it is also an opportunity, Madame Chair, to look at the current restrictions on Goffstown Back Road and maybe there is something we can do because of the change in the businesses in Manchester to improve the quality of life for the people up there.

Chairman Sysyn stated also when they go back to the Planning Board they are going to have to have restrictions of ours anyway for whatever they do like we do in Manchester.

Communication from Mayor Baines regarding a proposal from Community Resources for Justice submitted to the Federal Bureau of Prisons for a federal halfway house in Manchester and urging the Committee on Traffic and Public Safety to schedule meetings to discuss the issue with federal officials and others involved.

Chairman Sysyn stated before I take any motions we discussed this at the full Board level and we wrote a letter objecting to this Federal halfway house. I don't think that we need to have anymore meetings but what is the pleasure of the Committee?

Alderman Forest stated as you may or may not remember, when this came up before the full Board several months ago I was the only Alderman who voted in favor of talking to these people.

Alderman O'Neil replied no you weren't.

Alderman Forest stated then my recollection is off but anyway at that time I wanted to speak to them and at that time I would have voted for a motion to have them come to us but I believe the Board made it perfectly clear at that time that they didn't want to talk to them and they didn't want it in the City. I seem to think now that the Board spoke its mind on this and I guess I want to say that I don't want to hear from them either. I think we have made up our mind that we don't want them in the City and I think I will go with that and urge this Committee to vote that way.

Alderman O'Neil stated I agree with the statement that Alderman Forest has made. We discussed this at the full Board level on at least two occasions. I think the Board has made it very clear of the direction they want to go in. I was on the losing side of that. I was open to having a discussion and I will vote that today but I do think we need to bring some closure to this. The full Board has taken a vote on this issue.

Alderman Guinta stated I think it is probably prudent to at least have an update from the Committee as to the progress of this issue. As I understand it, the issue is still moving forward and the Bureau of Prisons is still moving forward. That is a concern for me. While I would agree with my colleagues that I don't think we need to discuss the issue with the Bureau of Prisons in terms of should we or should we not entertain the idea of having a Federal halfway house in the City

because I think the City has addressed that particular issue. I do think that we require some sort of update as to the status. I don't know who else is on this committee that is being headed up by the Chief. Does Lt. Valenti have any information that he could share?

Lt. Valenti stated actually the Chief has attempted to contact quite a few people and has spoken to some. He made some calls down to Boston, the Community Resource for Justice in Boston, MA represented by Atty. David Encinzo. Basically when he called he received no answer so that is still open. Community Solutions – he called them in Windsor, CT. He had very little contact with an attempt to follow-up on the process. He called down there. He also called Tom Tarr, Chief Probation Officer for the District of NH and he is on vacation until this Wednesday. The Chief also called Peter Rousseau, who is Mr. Tarr's assistant. He was not able to find the file. He was looking for the letter sent from the BMA to Mr. Tarr opposing the halfway house. He placed a call with Dave Dwyer, Community Corrections Manager, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Boston, MA and he was never able to speak to an actual person. A message was left at his office and on his cell phone last week. He spoke with Stuart Rowells, Administrative Community Corrections, Federal Bureau of Prisons in Washington, DC. They were still in the process of looking at the bids. Upon research, the letters sent to Tom Tarr were never forwarded to him. The letters were faxed that day and a confirmation of receipt of the letters took place. Mr. Rowells informed the Chief that the letters would be considered but would not be the determining factor. Then the Chief received a call back from Dave Dwyer who said that he did not receive the letters from the Board that were sent to Tom Tarr. He felt that it was not the responsibility of Mr. Tarr to forward the letters to him.

Alderman Guinta asked could you say that again.

Lt. Valenti answered Mr. Dwyer advised the Chief that he did not receive the letters from the Board sent to Mr. Tarr. Mr. Tarr never sent the letters to Washington.

Alderman Guinta asked who is Mr. Dwyer. Is he from Boston?

Lt. Valenti answered yes I believe so.

Alderman Guinta asked he said it wasn't the responsibility of Mr. Tarr to forward those letters to him.

Lt. Valenti answered yes.

Alderman Guinta asked whose responsibility would it be.

Lt. Valenti answered I don't know. I guess it would be the City's. He further advised that he would not be involved in the process until a bid was accepted and then he would manage the project and all other inquiries would go through the project manager in DC.

Alderman Guinta asked do we know when the Bureau of Prisons is going to make a determination with respect to the two answers to the RFP.

Lt. Valenti replied I would say at this point, no.

Alderman Forest stated I don't think Lt. Valenti can answer this but weren't we originally sent a letter that said if the City didn't want it they would stop and apparently it seems like they have been pushing more and more since we said we didn't want it. We have to find out who we have to notify. From this I guess that person is saying it is not his responsibility so we have to find a person who is responsible and actually send him the letter.

Alderman Guinta responded that was with respect to the letter. It sounds like Mr. Dwyer is the regional administration and Rowells is the administrator in Washington so those are the two people that we should be corresponding with. It appears from what the Lieutenant is saying that those would be the two people involved in the decision and it sounds like the Chief did send those letters to the administrator in Washington. He has those letters. We just need to find out what his timeframe is for a decision and I guess what the other factors would be in determining a location.

Lt. Valenti answered correct.

Chairman Sysyn asked didn't they also say that they were looking to go on Elm Street.

Alderman Guinta answered that is a proposal from Community Resources for Justice, which is one of the companies that answered the RFP. Their new potential location is Elm Street. The Bureau of Prisons still needs to make a determination whether they are going to accept the Community Resources for Justice proposal or the other company and I don't remember the name off the top of my head.

Alderman Forest stated from what I understand there are two companies who are looking in the City for viable spots.

Alderman Smith stated I am looking at the second page of the proposal from Community Resources for Justice. In regards to the documents, they have a

woman's name, Contracting Officer for the Federal Bureau of Prisons in Washington – Patricia Donahue-Ormandy. Apparently in reading this it looks like she is the one that is going to look over the documents to see if they are...from my understanding I voted for discussion and we had discussion and as you know the halfway house was going in Ward 10. I met with Mr. Wheeler from Goffstown and we got together and we had about 100 participants from Goffstown and Manchester and they advised us of the site. From what I understand and I still understand it this way is they can do almost anything they want to do. That is all I can tell you at this stage.

Chairman Sysyn stated I don't think they are going to stop looking for a place in Manchester. I think that we need to reiterate that we are not in favor of it.

Alderman Guinta responded it does sound like we have done that to the proper person through the Chief. It does sound like we are waiting for somewhat of a response so maybe the Chief could give us an update in a week or so. I think would probably...

Alderman Smith interjected in all fairness the Police Chief was there with me that night and he opposed it at that time and there were officials from the State Bureau of Prisons and from the company in Boston. It was a well run meeting. There was not much animosity between the residents and the administration and everything went pretty well. From what I understand in talking to the experts they can roughly put it anywhere they want to.

Chairman Sysyn stated that is what it sounds like to me.

Alderman O'Neil stated Alderman Smith pointed out that point of contact. I didn't hear that name come up in the summary that Lt. Valenti read. Maybe he can just...as part of the agenda there is an attached letter with a contact name as Alderman Smith pointed out and maybe we could make sure that person gets a copy of the letter, although I think we have sent it to the people above in the chain.

Chairman Sysyn stated what we need is an update from the Chief.

Alderman O'Neil responded we got the update. I think the City's position is clear even though I was on a different side of it and I think keeping this coming up time after time is wrong although as long as the Chief keeps updating us.

Alderman Guinta moved to receive and file. Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman O'Neil being duly recorded in opposition.

Communication from Peter Lauzon of The Manchester Church of Christ requesting the use of the Pine Street parking lot at the Federal Building on October 2, 2004 from 7 AM until 5 PM for their annual “Give-Away-Day”.

On motion of Alderman Guinta, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil it was voted to approve the request under the direct supervision of the City Clerk, Fire, Highway, Police, Traffic and Risk Departments.

Communication from Jane Beaulieu of FOR MANCHESTER requesting the use of Arms Park on September 11 and 12 for the Second Annual Mill City Festival.

On motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil it was voted to approve the request under the direct supervision of the City Clerk, Fire, Highway, Police, Traffic and Risk Departments.

Traffic Signal Optimization and Synchronization Study on NH 28 South Willow Street submitted by the Southern NH Planning Commission.

Alderman O'Neil asked do we need to send this any place or can we just receive and file it.

Chairman Sysyn asked can we receive and file it Tom.

Mr. Tom Lolicata answered yes.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Guinta it was voted to receive and file.

Communication from Richard J. Mulvee of the Tower Realty Group requesting that two of the nine parking spaces on Elm Street in front of the Hampshire Plaza be designated as Handicap Only with a 30-minute limit.

Chairman Sysyn stated he is looking for those spaces because some of the people would have a lesser walk from Elm Street than they would in the parking garage. They have handicapped parking in the parking garage now.

Alderman Forest asked, Tom, according to the ADA and the specifications for those handicapped zones can we...I know we can do it but can we limit it to 30 minutes.

Mr. Lolicata answered that would take an act by the Aldermen. Right now you have three-hour parking at meters for handicapped. You also have to realize that

you are going to lose a couple of meters down there and you have to have curb cuts for these things. That is a Federal law, not ours. So there is a little bit of work that has to be done down there if we are going to do this.

Alderman Forest stated I know there are plenty of handicapped spots across the street but there are none that I know of on that side.

Mr. Lolicata responded I don't think there is either. There are plenty in the garage but it is flat and as you said it takes longer to come from the garage than from Elm Street. I think they have steps to go up off of Elm Street don't they.

Alderman Forest replied there are steps along Mechanic Street.

Mr. Lolicata stated I am trying to picture right in front of the building itself. If we put in those handicapped spots is it flat. I guess it is just a matter of spacing then.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I would note that I believe under the statute the limit is two hours.

Alderman Guinta asked, Tom, this letter from Tower Realty notes that it is for the post office, IRS and HUD visitors. IRS and HUD at this point are only in that building on a temporary basis. So, if it is primarily for IRS and HUD then maybe we should wait to see when those offices are moving back to the Federal building in which case this really wouldn't be necessary.

Mr. Lolicata answered that would be my recommendation also.

Alderman Forest stated they are going to be there for at least three years.

Alderman Guinta asked are you sure it is that long.

Alderman Forest stated it may be longer. I heard originally five but I know three because of the renovations at the Norris Cotton building. It is going to take 3-5 years.

Alderman Guinta stated I would feel a little more comfortable knowing exactly how long they are going to be there. I heard it was shorter than three years.

Chairman Sysyn stated no they are looking at three to five years.

Alderman O'Neil stated maybe it would be appropriate to put this on the table and get the Tower Realty people in here to clarify what the timeframe is.

Chairman Sysyn stated we can invite them to the next Traffic Committee meeting.

Alderman Forest asked can we listen to what Mr. Sawyer has to say and then table this item.

Mr. Eric Sawyer stated I am the Chairman of ACCESS Manchester and I am speaking on this issue. We looked into the state statute some time ago that provides for free parking for the disabled or fee less parking. That is governed by...the Governor and the Legislature have dictated that to the Governor's Commission on the Handicapped and they have a set rule that limits that to three hours for free parking.

Alderman Guinta asked could you repeat that please.

Mr. Sawyer stated the state statute provides free parking for the disabled. We came across this a few years ago when we looked at how long free parking was to be for. The Governor's Commission on the Disabled is charged with promulgating a set of rules for that and part of their promulgation of the rules was that it limits it to three hours.

Alderman Forest stated I know that we increased it to four in some places.

Alderman O'Neil stated it may be appropriate to table it and get more information. That is a good point.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to table this item and request that a representative from Tower Realty attend the next meeting.

Responses to report on Parking Operations.

Chairman Sysyn stated we have a response from the Traffic Department that we just received this evening and we have one from Finance.

Alderman Guinta asked would it make sense to table this so we could take some time to read these responses and have the Clerk's Office...did the Clerk get it before us. Has the Clerk had a chance to respond to this?

Deputy Clerk Normand replied we just got it tonight.

Alderman Forest stated I know that I have been asking for these reports for over 18 months. There has been some investigation done by both the City Clerk's Office, myself and the Police Department and all that. This report from the Traffic

Department just came in tonight although we have been talking about this for 18 months. I guess we should table it. This is a lot of material to look over and everything else. I believe that this report should have been in long before tonight. That is my comment.

Alderman Guinta replied I would concur.

Alderman Forest moved to table the item.

Alderman Smith stated I would just like to comment. I went through this report and it is going to detail quite a bit of cost from every department and we don't have any cost estimates. Certain departments said we need two or three men to execute it and we don't have site control, etc. I believe the only thing we can do is table it and try to work and piecemeal it. It has to be corrected somewhat.

Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion to table. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Report from the Traffic Department regarding depositing meter money directly to the bank.

Alderman Forest asked where is that report.

Chairman Sysyn stated it is a separate item.

Alderman Forest stated this pretty much goes with the traffic thing but I think it is something...I am not sure if it came, I know originally it came through this Committee and I am not sure if we sent this to the Administration Committee but there was supposed to be a report about the lock box system and I think that is what this is about. I think we were supposed to get an update on this and I am not sure if there is anyone here to discuss it.

Deputy Clerk Normand responded I think that Finance as part of their report that they submitted tonight dealt with depositing the money directly to the bank and I think Joanne Shaffer could probably comment on that.

Mr. Lolicata stated that also includes Item 10 on the agenda.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated we are talking about Item 10.

Alderman Forest stated this is separate from the traffic thing. This is something we agreed to implement.

Ms. Joanne Shaffer stated I outlined that in letter form. I think there are two letters that I submitted to you this evening. One of them is comments on Item 9, which is one that I think you just tabled and the other one specifically refers to Item 10. I think to put it in a nutshell the Traffic Department representatives met. I had the supervisor from the money operations at Citizens Bank there and I also had one of the supervisors from Loomis Fargo who is the armored car service that provides transportation for the City. I think generally we outlined a process whereby unfortunately when the money is collected from the meters it cannot go directly to the bank because of liability reasons and so forth. The bank won't allow that because their employees will not pick up the canisters that contain that money. In addition to that there would have to be multiple stops at the bank on a daily basis for all of the different routes that are picked up and of course that is not a practicality from the bank's perspective. However, we have devised a method whereby we would get new bags from the bank, the money would be transported back to the Traffic Department and then it would be emptied into those bags, which would save the time that was spent removing the slugs, tokens, etc., and the sorting and counting of coins by the Traffic Department. In addition to that, security services will pick up those deposits separately bagged by the various routes that Traffic picks up on a daily basis, which means that Traffic will not have to transport those to the bank, which will decrease the liability of the City and so forth because as soon as those funds are turned over to the armored car service any of that liability is alleviated. So that saves the time for the counting and sorting of the money and then the delivery or the trip that they have to make to the bank with those deposits. I think from a discussion perspective we ironed out all of the points and fully discussed them. I think we are probably going to be ready to go with that in the next couple of days. We are just waiting for Loomis Fargo, the security provider, to clarify exactly what time he will be able to pick those funds up on a daily basis. We are pleased with the effort that everybody put forward and the fact that everybody is willing to try to do things in a different way. The system isn't perfect. We would like to be able to find some new types of canisters so that the monies could go right from the meters into the bags but as with any other process you work out a few things initially and then we will go from there and try to improve on the process.

Alderman Guinta asked can we take these two issues separately or should we be taking them together.

Alderman Forest replied I am not sure. I would have to refer to the Clerk. I believe that we had passed this separately to get the lock box and all of that and implement that along with two part-time PCO's. I think that all came in one package but I will let Carol speak.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated at the last meeting of the Committee on Traffic we had submitted the report that we had and one of the actions the Committee took was to request the Traffic Department to work with Finance to go something about the collections. We had actually at the time presented two options in the presentation. One was a direct deposit to the bank, which had been based on preliminary discussions with the Finance Department and the second option was exactly what they are suggesting to you this evening, which was to have the collections done, brought back to the Traffic Department and then have a security company bring the money to the bank. I see no reason to delay that. I think it would be taking a step backwards at this point and from what I understand all of the appropriate parties were gathered together to come to this agreement.

Alderman Guinta asked Tom do you have anything to add.

Mr. Lolicata replied the only thing is we based this on trying this to see if it works out. I am waiting to see what is going to happen when this is picked up. We haven't got a time yet and I am going to see if it is going to cost them hours or if it is going to be efficient like we think it will be. I would like to give it a 30-day trial. That is what we all agreed upon.

Alderman Smith stated I am more interested in the cost of implementing it. Could you give me the total cost for the lock box, the two temporary people, the handheld equipment and so forth? Are you going to do that or what are you going to do?

Deputy City Clerk Johnson responded I would just like to clarify. You are talking about two separate things. The lock box is actually dealing with Ordinance Violations. It has nothing to do with the Traffic Department and I am not sure where the lock box came in for parking permits. We may have discussed that as a future option if you had it all together but right now I don't see that as an option right off the bat.

Alderman O'Neil stated we did talk about the lock box for direct...to collect the revenue from the street and sent it right to a lock box. We did talk about that.

Chairman Sysyn replied that was Ordinance Violations though.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated for Ordinance Violations we were talking about setting up a lock box.

Alderman O'Neil responded we were talking about the collection of the meter money.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated for the meter money that is not considered a lock box. That is really a deposit that you are doing. It is two different things and I just don't want to have confusion as to what is what. I think that in terms of the coin deposits, having the security company come and do a pick up obviously there is going to be some cost associated with that but the idea was to remove some of the labor intensiveness that you are paying for so they could be relieved to do other things. Joanne may have the numbers for you on what the costs are strictly for the coin collection.

Alderman Forest stated I guess I am getting confused here on all of this but I know when we implemented the parking control officers, the lock box and most likely this also there was talk about it taking two to three to four months to implement it and we were going to get a monthly report. I thought that is what this was. I was a little surprised to hear Joanne say that it could be ready in a couple of days. Whatever it turns out to be I agree with what they are doing.

Alderman O'Neil asked didn't we already direct them to do this.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson answered yes you have already directed the department to proceed with that and they are really reporting to you. I think what they are saying is that they want to do it only on a 30-day trial rather than a permanent basis so perhaps you want them to come back in 30 days and give you a report. That is up to the Committee.

Alderman O'Neil asked Joanne can we enter into a contract with a security company to pick it up for only 30 days.

Ms. Shaffer answered what we do is sub-contract for security services through the bank so they can provide it to us for whatever duration we request that it be provided and then they just bill us.

Alderman O'Neil stated I just want to make it clear that the Board took a vote not to do a trial on this. The Board took a vote that it will happen. If you are asking...if the recommendation from staff is that we do it as a trial we need to take a vote on that but I just want to be clear that we have already voted to direct staff to do this.

Chairman Sysyn stated so this is just for discussion purposes.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated you can receive and file.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated as long as there is an understanding that it is not a 30 day trial and that is supposed to continue and if there is a problem I would

presume that staff would come back and say these are problems and the Committee can reconsider that action.

Ms. Shaffer replied as I stated we are ready to proceed and then of course if you see that there are problematic circumstances that occur, I mean obviously you step in and resolve them and make it as efficient as possible.

Alderman Forest moved to receive and file. Alderman Guinta duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Communication from Joseph Kelly Levasseur, Esq. regarding Clifton Crowley's noise complaint.

Alderman Forest moved to receive and file. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Guinta asked can we just send a letter to him telling him what the Board did at last week's meeting.

Alderman Forest answered he was there.

Alderman Guinta replied not at 1 AM. We took this up at 1 AM. Why don't we just send him a letter telling him what the Board action was?

Alderman Forest moved to amend the motion to send Mr. Levasseur a letter informing him of the Board action on August 3, 2004. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the amendment. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote on the motion as amended. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Sysyn advised that the Traffic Department has submitted an agenda, which needs to be addressed as follows:

NO PARKING

On A St. south side, from a point 235 feet west of
Bowman St. to a point 100 feet west

On Blaine St., north side, from Second St. to a point 50
feet easterly

Alderman Smith

On Malvern St., west side, from Lowell St. to Concord
St.

On Beacon St., west side, from a point 100 feet south of

Lowell St. to a point 80 feet south
On Ashland St., east side, from Concord St. to Lowell
St.
Alderman Sysyn

NO PARKING (8AM-5PM MON-FRI)

On Rogers St., east side, from Hayward St. to a point
260 feet south
Alderman Shea

YIELD SIGN

On Theophile St. at Agnes St., SWC
Alderman Smith

STOP SIGN

On Hall St. at Pearl St. – 4 Way – NWC, SEC
On Pearl St. at Russell St., NEC, SWC
Alderman Sysyn

On S. Taylor St. at Laxson Ave., NWC, SEC – 4-Way Stop
School Zone
Alderman DeVries

RESCIND NO PARKING

On Rogers St., east side, from Hayward St. to a point
260 feet southerly (#8080)
Alderman Shea

On Rogers St., west side, from Harvard St. to a point 195
feet (#3573)
On Blaine St., north side, from Second St. to a point 100
feet Easterly (#8853)
Alderman Smith

On Elm St., east side, from Merrill St. to a point 45 feet
south (#2955)
On Union St., west side, from a point 65 feet north of
Plummer St. to a point 110 feet north (#6236)
Alderman Guinta

RESCIND NO PARKING BUS STOP

On Ashland St., east side, from Concord St. to a point
110 feet north (#2575)

Alderman Sysyn

RESCIND PARKING 15 MINUTES

On Laurel St., south side, from Beech St. to a point 70 feet westerly (#3222)

Alderman Sysyn

PARKING 1 HOUR (8AM-6PM)

On Kelley St., east side, from Montgomery St. to Dubuque St.

Alderman Thibault/Forest

RESCIND PARKING 1 HOUR (8AM-6PM)

On Kelley St., east side, from Montgomery East Back St. to Dubuque St.

Alderman Thibault/Forest

PARKING 2 HOURS (8AM-8PM 7 DAYS)

On Putnam St., north side, from Cartier St. to Dubuque East Back Street

On Putnam St., south side, from a point 38 feet east of Dubuque East Back Street to Cartier St.

Alderman Thibault

PARKING 2 HOURS (8AM-6PM)

On Elm St., east side, from Merrill St. to a point 45 feet south

Alderman Guinta

NO PARKING LOADING ZONE

On Belmont St., east side, from a point 45 feet north of Summer St. to a point 40 feet north

Alderman Osborne

On Elm St., east side, from a point 40 feet north of Hayward St. to a point 90 feet north

Alderman Guinta

CROSSWALK

On Commercial St. at the Bridge St. Bridge Staircase

Alderman Guinta

RESCIND PARKING 2 HOURS (8AM-6PM MON-SAT)

On Elm St., east side, from Hayward St. to Merrill St.

(#8351)
Alderman Guinta

RESCIND NO PARKING HANDICAP ZONE

On Market St., north side, from Hampshire Lane to a
point 116 feet west (#7961)
Alderman Guinta

VAN ACCESSIBLE PARKING SPACE (1 HOUR PARKING CITY
BUSINESS ONLY 8AM-5PM MON-FRI)

On Market St., north side, from Hampshire Lane to
a point 16 feet north
Alderman Guinta

PARKING 15 MINUTES (MON-FRI)

On Kelley Street, north side, from Hevey Street to a point 50 feet easterly.
Alderman Forest

Mr. Lolicata stated one of the constituents involved in one of these ordinances would like to remove it. It is the one on Clarke Street. He called and asked to have that removed until further notice.

Alderman O'Neil asked did you contact Alderman Roy of it.

Mr. Lolicata answered he is aware of it.

Alderman O'Neil moved to approve the traffic agenda and remove the item on Clarke Street.

Mr. Lolicata stated I was just asked to remove this yesterday. Alderman Roy is aware of the ordinance. We went up there because of the Police Department and a constituent called at the last minute to have it removed until further notice.

Alderman O'Neil asked who did, Alderman Roy.

Mr. Lolicata answered no the gentleman himself but Alderman Roy is aware of this.

Alderman O'Neil asked is he in support of removing it.

Mr. Lolicata answered he is not aware of removing it, no. He is aware of the ordinance itself though.

Alderman O'Neil asked if the Alderman requested it how can we remove it without his...

Mr. Lolicata interjected the gentleman involved with it wanted it taken off. He didn't want no parking. He thought about it. He was going to ask his neighbor and he asked me to take it off.

Alderman O'Neil replied I understand that but the request list here came from Alderman Roy. The procedure should be that Alderman Roy should have been notified that the neighbor had changed the request. That did not happen?

Mr. Lolicata responded no. It was too quick.

Alderman O'Neil stated it needs to happen. I thought we talked about this at a meeting once. The Alderman involved needs to be notified.

Mr. Lolicata replied I understand that. This was pretty quick.

Alderman Guinta duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Discussion regarding signage at the Rines Center.

Mr. Lolicata stated this is two-fold. One is a recommendation from Georgie Reagan involving parking in front of the Rines Center if you will for two spots for people involved with the McIninch Gallery. Also up there right now is an ordinance and it says it is for the Health Department. Well everybody goes to the rear of this building for Health and I thought this should be changed maybe to parking for the Rines Center only instead of just Health. It is a general thing for everybody who has business in that building.

Alderman Guinta asked how many different departments are in that building.

Mr. Lolicata answered at least three that I know of. Welfare is in there now with the Office of Youth Services.

Alderman Guinta asked Health, Welfare and the Office of Youth Services.

Mr. Lolicata answered yes those three that I know of and the Art Gallery.

Alderman Guinta asked is your recommendation that we change it to the Rines Center.

Mr. Lolicata answered it is worth it because everybody who goes to the Health Center goes to the rear of the building. It makes sense.

Alderman O'Neil moved to change the parking signs from Health Department to Rines Center in front of the building. Alderman Guinta duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman O'Neil stated we have no attachments on the agenda for this item.

Alderman Guinta asked Mrs. Reagan are you looking for parking spots dedicated to...

Mrs. Georgie Reagan answered the arts. It is for the McIninch Gallery staff only and we had asked for two spaces because they will be there pretty much on a daily basis and the access from parking in the rear is not acceptable for people carrying large pieces of artwork. Since there already is a handicapped parking spaces and the rest of it seemed to be misclassified, if we could just have two spaces that say McIninch Family Gallery, Staff Only and Manchester Arts Commission at the bottom of that with the two signs having arrows pointing in each direction.

Alderman O'Neil asked is the Health Department on the first floor.

Mrs. Reagan answered they are on the lower floor.

Alderman O'Neil asked who is on the Elm Street floor.

Mrs. Reagan answered the Welfare Department.

Alderman O'Neil asked don't they have to park out back.

Mrs. Reagan answered they have no access from the back. I don't know where there parking is.

Alderman O'Neil stated I just think we need to be consistent with the building and if we provide two spaces on the street for the Arts Commission we are going to have to do the same thing for everyone else then and we could open up a...I don't disagree with providing two spaces with you I just don't know if I agree they need to be out in front of the building.

Mrs. Reagan responded they wouldn't make sense any other place.

Alderman Guinta stated you are not talking about staff you are actually talking about when art is being loaded and unloaded.

Mrs. Reagan replied I am talking about the staff of the permanent residence, which would be the Manchester Artists Association.

Alderman Guinta asked why couldn't they just park at the first available spot closest to the building.

Mrs. Reagan answered there are not always available spots because you know Pappy's Pizza across the street probably uses it or people who park in the back and find out that they have to walk around the building use it. People automatically drive up in front because it still says Health Department. I think Tom's idea was to call it the Carol Rines Center and it made it available to everyone but it was not specific about it being the Health Department because that is no longer the case anyway.

Alderman Guinta asked can we see how changing the name on the signage affects the parking and then maybe address parking if it still needs to be addressed at a later date. Is that a fair compromise?

Mrs. Reagan answered it is fair but I think they will require it no matter how long...

Alderman Guinta interjected again you are talking about staff. You are talking about someone who goes there everyday?

Mrs. Reagan stated yes and there are volunteers who will be going in and out of there everyday and there has to be someplace for them to park to get in and out. Each time you leave that facility you have to lock the door. If you left anything in your car and you were parked in the back or wherever you were you have to secure that door in order to leave that space and if they were at a meter or had to move their car, each time they had to leave their car they would have to secure the space.

Alderman Guinta asked are you saying if they are parked at metered parking and they have to go out to feed the meter.

Mrs. Reagan answered there are no meters there now. There are no meters there for anyone. There is no time limit.

Alderman O'Neil asked Georgie are you looking for two dedicated spaces on Elm Street for people at the Art Gallery.

Mrs. Reagan answered yes.

Alderman O'Neil stated my concern is that we don't provide that for anyone else there now. We could be opening a door that we don't want to go through. I can support providing on-site parking there for people somewhere but I don't know about providing parking right outside the front door for them.

Mrs. Reagan asked where else do you think it could be.

Alderman O'Neil answered there is parking on the side and in the rear.

Mrs. Reagan asked could that be specified for them.

Alderman O'Neil answered I don't know who is responsible. Is Health responsible for the building? I will move that we refer this to Fred Ruscsek to work out with Georgie Reagan and report back at the next Traffic meeting.

Alderman Guinta duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated we have a couple of items of new business. The first one is an addition to the traffic agenda. It is 15 Minute Parking (Monday-Friday) on Kelley Street, north side, from Hevey Street to a point 50 feet easterly. That is at the request of Alderman Forest and Alderman Thibault.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Guinta it was voted to approve the request.

Deputy Clerk Normand stated the second item is St. George parking. It has been discontinued effective immediately per the request of Westbridge, Inc., the new owner of the St. George parking lot.

Chairman Sysyn stated I wanted to discuss this under new business. Mr. Dion called me the other day and I asked him to put something in writing. He just handed it to me tonight. They are looking at making one-way streets up there on Orange and maybe Pearl to help with parking in that area. Somebody bought St. George's. It was probably the people who were thinking about putting the halfway house there. No, who bought it?

Alderman Guinta responded Westbridge.

Chairman Sysyn stated anyway they are blocking off that parking lot to anybody...the residents used to pay \$20/month to park there. I don't know how we can solve this. This is something that I thought we could bring in for discussion and maybe...

Alderman O'Neil interjected I think we need some information back from the Traffic Department, Police Department, Highway and Fire Department on what this could do to the area. I will move to table this and refer it to those four departments and maybe Planning also.

Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion to table. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Guinta stated I have a quick question for Tom under new business. Tom, while we were going through the rest of the meeting I had a quick opportunity to run through your response on the parking operations. Did your office solicit responses or information from downtown businesses with respect to the Traffic Department? All of these letters that are attached, what is this?

Mr. Lolicata answered this came up over a year or so ago when people were talking about the Traffic Department and the operations. Denise over the last year and a half gathered some letters that Traffic had received from people in regards to the way we were handling the permits. She just made those attachments to more or less prove a point I guess.

Alderman Guinta asked so when letters start out with "as requested we are writing to report" you are telling me that no one solicited these.

Mr. Lolicata replied that is what she asked for. She asked for an honest response from them on the way they were being handled, service, etc.

Alderman Guinta asked is there a problem with morale in your department. You are telling me in this letter that there is a morale issue.

Mr. Lolicata answered this has been going on a long time – sure.

Alderman Guinta asked is anything being done to resolve that.

Mr. Lolicata answered we are doing our best. The men are still there and that is all that counts.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I just wanted to clarify on behalf of the Finance Department probably more than the Clerk's Office...there was a discussion earlier

about a lock box. The Committee actually had asked everybody to proceed with a lock box and get the handhelds ordered and so forth for the Police Department and Ordinance Violations. That is actually in process. Those handhelds have been ordered and they wanted to update the Committee and let them know that they are proceeding with a lock box unless otherwise instructed because it was their understanding that they should be doing that. You did table the report and the responses to it and part of the response was an update on lock boxes.

TABLED ITEMS

14. Portion of report of Traffic Committee referred back to Committee
04/08/2003 regarding the adoption of regulations:

One-Way Streets

Hollis Street

Kidder Street

This item remained on the table.

15. Report, if available, from the Building Commissioner and City Solicitor
regarding speeding up the demolition process.

This item remained on the table.

16. Report regarding parking garage contract RFP's.

This item remained on the table.

17. Report of the Traffic Committee recommending that all metered parking be
changed from Monday-Friday, 8AM-8PM to Monday-Friday, 8AM-6PM.

This item remained on the table.

18. Discussion relative to usage of seatbelts by City employees in City
vehicles.

On motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil it was voted to
remove the following item from the table.

Alderman Forest moved to receive and file. We have a letter from Harry that says
we have the rules and regulations in place so I would just say we should receive ad
file.

Alderman O'Neil stated I supported that but I don't know if we are directing employees to use the seatbelts with that policy.

Alderman Smith stated I believe the ordinance is already in there. According to Harry they are supposed to wear their seatbelts and if they get into an accident or something like that and they weren't wearing their seatbelt it is the individual's responsibility.

Alderman Forest stated the letter says we have a policy in place and we have been enforcing it and he doesn't recommend a change.

Alderman Smith stated the policy was passed in 1986.

Alderman Guinta stated if you read the ordinance it doesn't actually direct them to use seatbelts. It merely requires seatbelts to be maintained in a serviceable condition and will be readily available for drivers and passenger use. It doesn't direct them...this is with respect to maintenance and use. It doesn't actually direct the use of.

Alderman Smith stated it does say, "non-use of city vehicle/equipment seat belt assemblies which result in a reportable personal injury shall be explained why seat belts were not used."

Alderman O'Neil stated if that is the intent it doesn't read very well then. It probably needs to be cleaned up or brought up-to-date. I agree with what Alderman Smith but I, like Alderman Guinta, read that and I don't interpret it that way.

Alderman Guinta asked can we refer this to the City Solicitor for review and if the intent...if the language doesn't meet the intent could we address it through a recommendation from the Solicitor.

Alderman Forest stated before we do that maybe we should table it again and ask Harry to come to the next meeting. There is a sentence there that says I would not recommend changing this policy.

Alderman Forest moved to put the item back on the table and invite Harry Ntapalis and the Solicitor to the next meeting. Alderman Smith duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee